DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 758 JC 690 109

By-Anderson, Kenneth E.; And Others
The American Two-Year College in Transition.
Kansas Univ., Lawrence. School of Education.
Pub Date Jan 69
Note-31p.
Journal Cit-Kansas Studies in Education; v19 n1 Jan 1969
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.65
Descriptors-*College Role, *Comprehensive Programs, *Computers, *Junior Colleges, *School Expansion
Identifiers-*Kansas

Presented here are four guest lectures and a paper by the instructor from The Junior (Community) College, a class at The University of Kansas. Topics are: (1) "The Challenge to Higher Education in Kansas in the Decade Ahead," which deals with the tremendous expansion expected in the Kansas community college system and the needed responses to this growth; (2) "Trends in Junior College Education," which outlines the need for the junior college to provide a broader scope of educational services, to serve the inner-city more effectively, and to develop competent leadership; (3) "The Kansas Community Junior College Act," which explains the present operation and future plans of the state system; (4) "Computers and the Junior College," which proposes a systems approach to facilitate junior college decision-making and planning; and (5) "The American Two-Year College," which traces the development of the two-year institution in its attempt to find its rightful role. (MC)

ED028758

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The American Two-Year College In Transition

Kenneth E. Anderson
Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.
Carl L. Heinrich
James K. Hitt
Tilghman H. Aley

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 20 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC 690 109

KANSAS STUDIES IN EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS PUBLICATIONS
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION—LAWRENCE, KANSAS

Vol. 19 January, 1969 No. 1

FOREWORD

During the spring semester of 1968, thirty junior college instructors, deans, and presidents attended a class entitled: The Junior (Community) College.

Four of the several guest lecturers provided me with written papers. It was the opinion of the class that these papers were of such significance that they should be made available to others in printed form. The University of Kansas is pleased to present these in this issue of the *Kansas Studies in Education*.

KENNETH E. ANDERSON
Class Instructor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE CHALLENGE TO HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE DECADE AHEAD—Kenneth E. Anderson 1

TRENDS IN JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION—Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. 4

THE KANSAS COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGE ACT—Carl L. Heinrich 12

COMPUTERS AND THE JUNIOR COLLEGE—James K. Hitt 17

THE AMERICAN TWO-YEAR COLLEGE—Tilghman H. Aley 22

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Editor of *Kansas Studies* ..... Donald C. Richardson
Executive Editor ..... Kenneth E. Anderson
Editorial Board ..... Karl D. Edwards, Oscar M. Haugh, Wayne Osness, Phil Rueschhoff, Richard Rundquist

Kansas Studies in Education is published during the school years as studies worthy of publication become available. Additional copies of this issue will be furnished at cost upon request to the Dean of the School of Education.

The Challenge to Higher Education in Kansas in the Decade Ahead

KENNETH E. ANDERSON, *Dean*
School of Education
University of Kansas

By 1978, we can expect to have some three million or more students enrolled in some 1,500 public junior colleges, independent, and church-related institutions. In Kansas, the public and private junior colleges may by 1978 enroll in excess of 20,000 students. If this prediction comes true, the junior college will have been the fastest growing institution (percentage-wise) of higher education in Kansas during the ten-year period.

If predictions become reality, then the junior colleges and the senior colleges must plan carefully to insure that the education received by our students in the next ten years possesses quality.

Apropos to the above is the first comprehensive nation-wide study of the transfer student by Dorothy M. Knoell and Leland L. Medsker entitled: *From Junior to Senior College: A National Study of the Transfer Student.* The volume is published by the American Council on Education. As the American Council brochure for January 14, 1966 says:

> With college enrollments soaring, the junior college is destined to become increasingly important as a stepping stone to the senior college. Yet all too little is known about the transfer student—who is he—how successful he is—what his problems are.
>
> If American youth are to be adequately served by the nation's higher education system, there must be more careful planning for transfer from junior to senior college, according to a report issued by the American Council on Education on January 10.
>
> While students who begin their work in junior colleges can usually look forward to successful completion of university or senior college programs, they often encounter serious stumbling blocks to progress as they make the transition.
>
> In attempting to expand opportunity at the lower division level and to strengthen education at the graduate level, master planners tend to assume that adequate educational opportunity between these two levels will be offered without any attention on their part to coordinated planning. The advantage gained by expanding opportunity in the junior colleges may well be negated by failure to provide new types of programs to accommodate the growing number of transfer students.
>
> The report indicates that it often takes the junior college transfer student longer to complete his work in the four-year institution than it does for the student who began his work in the university. However, it notes that high-ability transfer students encounter no more

difficulty in university work than do students of similar ability who began their work in the university.

Without junior colleges, the report noted, many young people of promise would never have the motivation or the opportunity to enter college, and thus the two-year college has in a sense "discovered" many potential professionals in a variety of fields.

The major objectives of the study were to find out how successful junior college students were in achieving their degree goals: how they compared with other students in regard to ability, grades, and time needed to earn their degrees; what effect institutional factors had on the success of the students; and what kinds of policies, practices, programs and machinery of articulation and coordination were operating during the period of study.

The report indicates that there are many factors which enter into and may retard progress of the transfer student. For example, it said financial aid programs at four-year colleges are not always organized with the best interests and needs of transfer students in mind, and counseling about college attendance and career choices needs to be improved at all levels.

Another point made in the report is that with increasing numbers of students and larger numbers of colleges and programs open to them, the states are going to need to exercise greater control over public institutions and the mobility of students among them.

Many states are now at some stage of creating master plans for higher education or of implementing plans which have recently been approved. Care is needed to identify the real role of the junior college in higher education for each state. The four-year institutions must bear their share of the responsibility for helping the public understand the junior college role, it said.

In terms of the above quotations, it is imperative that the State of Kansas look long and hard at its educational plans so that as the next ten years unfold, it can say in 1978 that the challenges of the day were met with fervor and dedication—and the result was a quality system of higher education.

There are roadblocks to achieving such a quality system in the next ten years. For example, the first requisite of any institution of higher education is a competent dedicated faculty. At the present time, the supply of college personnel will not keep pace with the number of students to be taught. This means that the colleges and universities of the United States may have to employ persons with less formal preparation than heretofore. Too, industry, government, and research are attracting a growing share of the qualified people who in earlier years would have gone into teaching and spent their professional lives there. Thus, the problem of maintaining quality instruction in our colleges will become more and more acute. Thus, the dazzling future predicted for the junior-college movement may, like Cinderella at

the stroke of twelve, face some disappointment. This possible dissappointment may be avoided by bringing the talents and efforts of the junior and senior colleges to focus on the problems of higher education such as: increasing enrollments, preparation of college teachers, articulation from one college level to another, new curricula to meet the needs of the day, in-service education, counseling, institutional research, and many more. Some of the answers are contained in the four papers which were presented in my Community Junior College class last spring.

In 1968, the Kansas Legislature enacted the Community Junior College Law. Now there is the necessity of breathing life into the creation so that it becomes a vibrant and living reality, sensitive to the needs of Kansas youth who will use it for a terminal education or as a stepping stone to additional education.

Trends in Junior College Education

Edmund J. Cleazer, Jr.
Executive Director
American Association of Junior Colleges

"In less than ten years we'll have more teachers voting than farmers." This interesting item of information for governors of the states and other persons holding public office comes from no less an authoritative group in these matters than the staff of the Republican Policy Committee of the United States Senate. *Where the Votes Are* is the title of the complete report which was published by the United States Printing Office on order of the Senate. A major section of the document deals with the "school-centered society." "Coming down the pike is an avalanche of school children like we've never experienced before" is the introduction. "A few years ago one-fourth of the total population was in school. A few years hence well over one-third of the people in the United States will be so occupied." "Education is the growth industry in America."

And this word of admonition is sounded—"The new electorate will likely opt for whatever method of government will marshal the most resources to keep improving the quality of education. If state-local systems appear archaic and impoverished, the new voter may very well choose to let the federal government become senior partner and run the show."

Regardless of what your political likes and dislikes might be, won't you agree that these are important observations. Education in the United States has become a matter of national policy. In most sections of the country, although the process of payment is still painful, there is recognition that the prudent appropriation of funds for this purpose is more in the nature of a capital investment with societal returns anticipated rather than an expense with the payoff only to the individual. Education is involving more people every year—not only because the country's population is increasing—not only because there are more school age children and college age youth, but also because the need for learning in an organized way is a necessity no longer reserved for the young. Children *and* their parents are enrolled. And just as the dangers of obsolescence face the adult and require continuing adaptation and new skills and attitudes so the governmental structures responsible for providing the educational resources must be shaped to meet unprecedented demands both in the size and quality of the job to be done. Increased mobility of our population, the obvious necessity for broader tax bases, the imperative requirement for the most effective and efficient utilization of our resources, and above all the astounding rate at which knowledge grows, call for new kinds of educational institutions and governmental structures capable of producing and sustaining them.

It is in this setting—"this school-centered society"—within this "growth industry of America," that the junior college, according to an article in

Harper's magazine is "going down the educational superhighway hell for leather."

The headlong pace by which junior colleges are appearing in all sections of this country is undoubtedly a familiar story to you. However, some of us who work with these institutions every day and should be accustomed to the facts and figures of growth continue to be amazed at the dramatic developments in some states. I was in Illinois a few months ago for a state-wide meeting of junior college personnel. Illinois, you will recall, was the home of William Rainey Harper, who while president of the University of Chicago had a great deal to do with the formulation of the junior college idea. He encouraged the founding of Joliet Junior College in 1902, the first public junior college still in existence. In that state now there is a transformation taking place which matches the significance of those events at the turn of the century. More than twenty junior colleges are in process of establishment. Only four of the 102 Illinois counties are not now covered by an existing junior college district or included in the new ones proposed.

In Florida almost 95% of the population are within commuting distance of junior colleges. Most of this development has taken place in the last ten years. Junior college growth in California, Texas, Michigan, and some other states is well known. But of very recent date is the opening of county community colleges in New Jersey, a network of 22 junior colleges, planned for Virginia; community colleges in Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and several in between. In New York the community college has been designated as the basic plank in long range educational planning for that state and 85 per cent of the population now reside within daily commuting distance of a public two-year college. There are junior colleges in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Alaska. A recent presidential commission declared: "A nationwide system of free public education through two years beyond the high school should be established." We are well on our way as a nation toward that goal. By 1975 we can expect to have as many as 1000 public junior colleges and 300 independent and church-related institutions. Enrollment may very well exceed three million and in many of the states well over half of the students beginning their college work will do so in junior colleges.

In addition to noteworthy numerical growth—there are 1.7 million students in some 915 junior colleges this year—more than 50 new colleges each year, there have been other recent impressive achievements.

Patterns of organization and administration have taken more effective form. In most states junior colleges now have their own districts, and boards of trustees, budgets, facilities, and organizational structures designed to further the goals of educational institutions in their own right. Even in those states where the junior college is still administered as part of the public school program, steps have been taken to give the institution its own identity.

Plans for higher education have been formulated in many of the states based upon studies of educational needs and resources. The junior college has in most cases been recognized as a full partner in the post-secondary educational program of the state. Provision for coordination of higher education services is found more and more frequently in a state-level organization in which the junior college participates. Only during the past few years has this come about. The establishment of the tripartite plan of higher education in California a few years ago with the junior college a full-fledged member of the coordinating council, gave some indication of what was to come in many of the other states.

These educational plans require money. Consequently, patterns of financial support are changing. The retarding effect of primary reliance upon local property tax revenues is yielding in most states to a substantial increase both in capital and operating funds from the state level. This is a trend which must continue if junior college services are to be available where they are most needed. And a new financial partner has appeared in the form of the federal government. Under such legislation as the Higher Education Facilities Act, the Allied Health Professions Act, the National Defense Education Act, and others, junior colleges have received substantial amounts. However, there is a cloud upon the horizon now. Although the needs were never greater and authorizations by Congress have taken this into account, appropriations are substantially below the amount authorized. Less support is available for private two-year colleges, as well as for other colleges and universities, for facilities construction.

Another very impressive gain has been registered over the past few years —the concept of the comprehensive junior college. Although there are still occasional debates about the merits of separating junior colleges concentrating on preparation of students for transfer to the four-year institutions and vocational-technical institutions for job preparation; there is no question that organizationally the move has been toward breadth of programs, including preparation for job entry, within the single institution. The fact that two-thirds of the students entering junior colleges do not transfer, at least not right away, to a four-year college, is resulting in growing concern for the curriculum implications of this fact. In North Carolina, Virginia, New York, and several other states, post-secondary vocational institutions have broadened their programs to become community junior colleges. I read editorials about junior colleges in dozens of newspapers each week and I am struck by the general public acceptance, judging by these newspaper accounts, of the comprehensive community college idea. Sometimes, I have the uneasy feeling that there is greater acceptance by the public of the sense of this educational approach than by some who have administrative or teaching responsibilities in our institutions. This broadened understanding of the role of the comprehensive institution, I believe, is one of the most impressive changes in public opinion of recent years.

These and many other gains could be reported for the junior college field. To a great extent the kind of institutions we represent are acknowledged nationally now as reputable, worthwhile, and essential.

So much for the gains—what of our goals? What are the tasks which lie ahead if junior colleges are to continue to justify their existence? To have a place today guarantees no future existence unless utility is maintained.

A much broader scope of educational services is urgently needed—Recently the former Secretary of Defense expressed his serious concern about the effect of poverty upon our national security:

> "Poverty in America aectffs our national security . . . by its appalling waste of talent. In the technical break-throughs, and sweeping over the second half of our century, the prime national resources become more and more the potential of the human brain. Innovation, technical break-throughs, and research and development now affect defense capabilities more than any other single factor. Only 14 per cent of the more than three million men in our armed formes fire weapons as their primary duty. A full 50 per cent must be trained in technical skills."

The Secretary was describing a plan for the military services to use advanced techniques to train up to 100,000 of the 600,000 each year who are rejected for physical or educational reasons. He said: "The 32 million Americans who are poor were not born without intellectual potential. They were not brain-poor at birth; but only privilege-poor, advantage-poor, opportunity-poor." Many "fail" the aptitude or achievement tests, he pointed out, because "these tests are geared to the psychology of traditional, formal, classroom, teacher-paced instruction." And because the cultural environment of many of these men "is radically different from that assumed by the test-designers."

"Clearly the way to measure his aptitude," he said, "is to place him in a situation that offers the encouragement he has never had before. That means a good teacher, and a good course of instruction, well supported by self-paced, audio-visual aids. It also means less formal, classroom, theoretical instruction, and more practical on-the-job training."

I can conceive of no better way of describing what I am convinced must be the attitude and methodology of the community junior college. The inductees of the armed services are just a sample of a much larger population. How many millions of people, youth and adults, are denied the values of achievement not only to their own detriment but that of the nation, because of faulty or inadequate educational services.

Last year the Governor of New York considered it necessary to recommend the establishment of a new type of youth college to offer opportunity to young people who ranked in the lowest third of their high school graduating class. Apparently the opportunity provided by the community colleges of that state was not accepted for some reason. Were the programs not suitable or were they not located where the students would be likely to come?

Secretary of Labor Wirtz testified before the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service that there are about 750,000 young people between the ages of 18 and 25 who are out of school and out of work, and probably at least as many who are employed in part-time work. And one more statistic of unmet educational need. There are about 17 million adults in need of basic education.

To what extent will the community junior college respond to the insistent and imperative changes taking place in both urban and rural life with educational services that promote constructive and orderly improvement of society? Is the community college as important and responsible in this process as the highway commission, urban renewal agencies, city planning commissions? Or is the community college even thought of in this context?

Does the community college function as an open-door institution which meets the student where he is with learning opportunities which fit his need even though this may mean an extension of educational services beyond the borders of the campus and into the neighborhood or even his home?

Educational services of this kind will not be easily established or maintained. This concept is an affront to those who have the notion that there is a recognized educational diet which is served in a collegiate atmosphere. "If they want it, they can come and get it, and if they don't like it, they don't have to eat it."

I am saying that what is learned today is so vital to the life of our society that we must take initiative to reach people with opportunities that in content and method enable them to learn to support themselves, to contribute toward our corporate life, and to develop social perspective and compassion. And many more people must be reached than ever before. The skills, knowledge, and attitudes of the sociologist, psychologist, economist, political scientist, counselor, musician, and poet, will be expressed not only to students on a campus but to these same individuals as people in the community which is their real context for learning.

So the community college in seeking a reference point for its bearings looks not so much toward the university and college as toward the life of the community in which it is located. Its measure of success will not be the extent to which it conforms to university programs or even the success of its graduates in academic terms in the university, but the extent to which the people it serves live productively. Of course, all communities are part of a larger society and both the local and larger society are in process of continuing change. This process of change and the fact of the larger society are taken into account in developing suitable learning experiences, but the point is that the services in our community junior colleges are derived from the educational needs we perceive in the people within our institutional reach.

What this means in terms of institutional programs is spelled out clearly in a recent publication of the American Association of Junior Colleges. *The*

Community College Commitment to the Inner-City is a report of a small conference on facilities for the inner-city community colleges. Participants were representatives from 13 big city community colleges, a number of architects and other consultants. Here are a few of the recommendations from that report:

> "The people we serve to a great extent won't come from comfortable middle class suburbs. Their characteristics, motivations, values will, to some extent be different."
>
> "There is a compelling need to take some phases of the urban college programs and services to where the people are. . . ."
>
> "We must encourage latent interest and abilities among disadvantaged students. We must provide opportunities for these individuals to achieve educational, occupational, and social mobility to the fullest extent their talent permits."
>
> ". . . levels of programs are needed not only for youth with latent potential for the professions, but also for those with more modest ability. Not to be overlooked are those with limited academic talent who will fill the many jobs requiring only minimum skills. These needs are too often neglected by the educational establishment."
>
> "Job development, the planning of appropriate field experiences for students, and intensive community involvement are all necessary ingredients of curriculum development. . . ."
>
> "Many students will attend part-time and at irregular hours. For most students, work is as important as in-class instruction. Thus, flexibility in scheduling and ready access of staff and facilities, and a patient assessment of student progress are all needed if a simultaneous program of work and study is to be made feasible."
>
> "The need for student services will rival the need for in-class instruction. Strong counseling and remedial programs will be required. But in addition, there may be the need for services performed by social workers. health teams, the legal profession, child care, and homemaking experts."
>
> And don't forget the adults. "The needs of adults for retraining and related services are of considerable concern. The . . . community college might well become a community center operating around the clock and all year long."

The issue is clearly before us. Society requires an institution like the community college—an educational resource center easily accessible—with many things for many people—a college which not only invites but persuades. The institutions we represent can do this job or can follow a more restrictive course of "regular" collegiate operations. There will undoubtedly be enough "business" to keep the institution going regardless of which way is chosen. However, if the community junior colleges choose the narrow road in

clientele and programs, the services I have described will be offered by other kinds of educational institutions which must then be created because the society will demand them.

Let me urge our institutions to broaden their educational services, not merely offset the establishment of competing institutions, but because there is no more important nor exciting arena for education today than the potential domain of the community college.

The need for leadership—Have I conveyed the impression that all the answers are not in, by any means. I hope so! There are no pat solutions, very few "how-to-do-it" bulletins. There are thousands of new board members and administrators and faculty members. The rules are still being written. The models are under construction. The junior college of the sixties and seventies is in the process of becoming. The issue of whether there will be junior colleges in this country has been decided, but it has not been determined how good they will be, in terms of their mission; to what extent they will be as notable qualitatively as they are quantitatively.

I am convinced that our greatest need is for competent leadership. Junior colleges are not alone in this requirement. In almost every activity in our society able leadership is a scarce commodity. However, circumstances make the necessity for the highest order of junior college leadership a critical matter. And I am speaking not only of the administrator, but certainly of the policy-making board which is the final institutional authority. And without question leadership is crucial in the thousands of classrooms, shops, and laboratories because ultimately the aims and objectives of the institution will be translated there.

We need people who can discern the job to be done. This is basic. And the vision should be not only farsighted and sharp but peripheral in its scope. We need those who can not only see the job but can communicate with others, can describe their views and understand the observations of others. Personnel are required who are adept in organization. Very few institutions these days are one-man shows. The president is no longer the father figure. Colleagues of mutual respect are associated together in an organized way with a division of labor related to professional preparation and institutional assignment. In a rapidly changing educational institution and in a college seeking its own identity, superior organizational ability is essential. But this is not an impossible task. It does require the kind of disciplined and objective approach to the problems of relationships within the institution that a professional seeks to apply to his own academic field.

We need a leadership that will challenge the cliches, the sacred cows, the academic bookkeeping, definitions, classifications, formulas for class load and student contact hours. There is a thick, heavy crust of custom. And yet we in the junior college field are often quick to seize upon the traditions, folkways, and procedures of other educational institutions. With dozens of new institutions established each year, we have a most unusual opportunity

to take that which fits but to question vigorously old forms that can produce no present evidence of utility. Although recognizing and respecting the professional competence of administrators and faculty, should it not be one of the basic responsibilities of the board to question the assumptions upon which proposed programs and budget are based. Any administrator worth his salt will welcome this test of his recommendations. Because it is only through this kind of testing that new and better policies are produced.

We may find ourselves with some added motivation because of the economic climate in which we work. The breadth of educational services I have described require money. At the same time society demands other services that require money. In most communities our institutions will have the financial support they need. But our communities ought to be able to expect of us the most effective utilization of materials and personnel possible.

And we need leadership to assure that the community relationship and involvement enjoyed by junior colleges actually strengthens and extends the work of the institution. It will take positive leadership of all college personnel and thoughtful citizens to make it clear in these days of mass communication and social and political causes that it is through the college that the community can examine issues, debate viewpoints, look for evidence, and accommodate differences.

If all of this seems like a pretty heft assignment, you are right, it is! There is nothing "junior" about the size of your responsibilities, and I must confess, that is one reason I cringe a little when I hear the familiar term "juco" applied to your institutions. The institutions you represent have an essential job to do that other colleges and universities can not or will not do. They can be educational instruments of tremendous worth to individuals and to this state. The extent to which their potential is fulfilled will be conditioned by their functioning as part of a total system of education. In this setting it is most appropriate to acknowledge that both the junior colleges and the universities have responsibility to see that this is done.

The Kansas Community Junior College Act

Carl L. Heinrich
Director of Community Junior Colleges
State Department of Public Instruction
Topeka, Kansas

It is important to note that all junior colleges operational prior to the enactment of the 1965 community junior college law were established by authority of the 1917 act. For this reason, the new law is probably the second most significant piece of legislation in the history of the Kansas junior college movement. This legislation provided for a major reorganization of Kansas junior colleges. It basically established a state system of public community junior colleges with the following significant provisions:

1. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction was designated the state authority for community junior colleges.
2. There was established an Advisory Council for Community Junior Colleges representative of the state board of regents, state board for vocational education, state colleges and universities, community junior colleges, secondary schools, labor, professions, agriculture, and business and industry.
3. Junior colleges were separated from high school extension providing for separate boards of control, facilities, faculties and administration.
4. The law provided for the expansion of community junior college taxing districts.
5. It authorized additional state aid and other revenues such as out-district tuition and student tuition both for in- and out-of-state students.
6. It provided that a state plan for community junior colleges be developed specifying philosophy which would include the role and function as well as procedures for the future development and establishment of new community junior colleges in Kansas.

I would like to elaborate on those specific authorities as provided in the new law and relate them to the development that has been accomplished the past three years.

Kansas State Plan for Community Junior Colleges

The first State Plan for Community Junior Colleges, developed by the newly organized Advisory Council was submitted to Adel F. Throckmorton, then State Superintendent of Public Instruction, for his approval. Mr. Throckmorton approved the plan on March 11, 1966, with the following comments:

> This State Plan is hereby approved subject to further study by the Advisory Council for Community Junior Colleges and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. As additional information becomes available, community junior college areas will be developed together with standards, criteria and policies governing the approval, establishment, operation and development of community junior colleges in Kansas. These will be incorporated in the State Plan.

This plan was further revised and approved by the late W. C. Kampschroeder, State Superintendent of Public Instruction on January 6, 1967, with the following comments:

> This plan is hereby approved subject to continuing study by the Advisory Council for Community Junior Colleges and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The approval of Amendment 3 (revision of Article VI of the Kansas Constitution) by the electorate on November 8, 1966, will require additional study in order to further develop the state educational system to include the designation of community junior college areas. Along with the establishment of a state system of community junior colleges, continual review is necessary of the criteria and policies governing the approval, establishment, operation and development of these two-year higher educational institutions. At regular intervals, the State Plan shall be modified and updated to be consistent with such changes.

The preamble of the State Plan is the key to the function of the community junior colleges in Kansas. It states and I quote:

> The purpose of the State Plan is to develop a uniform system of superior public community junior colleges integrated into the overall educational program of the State of Kansas. The Plan seeks to provide post high school education through a minimum number of institutions within reasonable commuting distance to every potential student in Kansas. Such community junior colleges shall be institutions of higher education, as differentiated from high school extension, and shall: (a) have qualified. separate faculties of their own; (b) have adequate, separate facilities of their own; (c) offer comprehensive, diversified programs of studies; and (d) be available to all students who want, need, and can benefit from such programs.

Thus, the main responsibilities of the community college as designated in the State Plan are to take the college to the student and to provide comprehensive diversified programs of studies which include not only academic or general education, but the vocational-technical and adult educational programs for the people of their service area. We are finding in the community junior colleges students with extremely diversified ranges of abilities, interests and ages which require comprehensive programs of study and services.

The State Plan further outlines the procedure for the establishment of new community junior colleges. This involves a comprehensive study to

determine the need requiring the answer to three major qustions: (1) Are the potential students available in the area; (2) Is there an adequate financial base to operate the institution; and (3) Is there evidence that existing post high school educational institutions are not now meeting the educational needs of the community? Thus, the community junior college is not established to compete with other post high school educational institutions, but to compliment them and the total higher educational system of Kansas.

New Institutions

Since 1965, two community junior colleges have been established under the procedures as outlined by law and stated in the State Plan. These new institutions are Johnson County Community Junior College and Seward County Community Junior College, Liberal, making a total of 19 public community junior colleges in Kansas.

Separation From High School Extension

All existing community junior colleges organized prior to 1965 have now completely separated from high school extension having elected their own separate boards of trustees who in turn have hired a president. All have expanded their taxing district to include a county in size except two which each share equally one county. Thus, we have 17 county community junior colleges and two with one-half county as their district.

Facilities

To date, 12 community junior college districts have passed bond elections for purposes of constructing complete new campuses. Six such campuses are now completed (Butler County CJC, El Dorado; Colby CJC; Fort Scott CJC; Cloud County CJC, Concordia; Neosho County CJC, Chanute; and Pratt CJC). Four new campuses are now under construction and will be completed by September, 1969 or early 1970. These colleges include: Allen County CJC, Iola; Barton County CJC, Great Bend; Dodge City CJC; and Garden City CJC. Two colleges, which include Independence CJC and Kansas City, Kansas CJC, plan to begin construction within the next year. Three additional community junior colleges have added or are adding new facilities to their present campuses. These include: Highland CJC; Hutchinson CJC; and Coffeyville CJC.

Finances

Operational revenues for community junior colleges are obtained from four major sources. These include local ad valorem tax, state aid, out-district tuition, and student tuition. A fifth source comes from federal aid. Last year, 1967-68, the per cent of each source in relation to the total was approxi-

mately 20 per cent state aid; three per cent federal aid; 13 per cent student tuition; 19 per cent out-district tuition, with the remaining being provided by local property tax.

The state provided last year, 1967-68, aid of $5.50 per Kansas resident credit hour, a total state contribution of approximately 1.4 million dollars for operation. During the 1968 Legislative Session in Senate Bill 479, this was increased to $8.00 per credit hour. This will probably increase the state aid contribution by some six to eight per cent; however, as recommended by the Legislative Council Study of Community Junior Colleges, published in 1964, 50 per cent of the operational costs should be borne by the State; 40 per cent by the local district, and 10 per cent by the student taking a major portion of the load from the local property taxpayer.

Curriculum

Junior colleges have, since their inception, accepted the responsibility of offering comprehensive programs. Not only were all such colleges providing the liberal arts curricula, but were also offering some vocational-technical programs. A survey in 1936 found the following vocational programs were being offered: accounting, salesmanship and advertising, office practice, machine shop, auto mechanics, carpentry, printing, costume design, clothing, foods, and general business including secretarial courses, to name a few.

Since the early 1950's to the present, the community junior colleges have offered over 65 different vocational-technical programs. In 1966-67 there were over 1,300 students enrolled in vocational offerings which was approximately 15 per cent of the total enrollment of all community junior colleges. Enrollment in these types of offerings increased 24 per cent in 1967-68.

Plans for the Future

Probably the two most important issues facing the community junior college movement in Kansas are finance and their role and function in relation to the existing system of area vocational-technical schools.

In order to broaden the tax base of our institutions and in complying with the 1965 community junior college act, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Mr. Murle M. Hayden, has proposed that the State be divided into not more than 22 taxing areas or districts for the purpose of establishing a property tax base for community junior colleges and area vocational-technical schools.

Under the area vocational-technical school law, we have one community junior college that has been designated as an area vocational-technical school (Cowley County); two colleges participating under the Type II plan in area vocational-technical schools (Hutchinson and Coffeyville Community Junior Colleges); a community junior college offering programs for the area vocational-technical school but the board of control is separate from the com-

munity junior college (Dodge City CJC); and other community junior colleges offering vocational-technical education not related to the area vocational-technical school system.

It is imperative that we determine the role of these two types of institutions simplifying, if at all possible, the financial and administrative organization thus eliminating unnecessary duplication both at the state and local levels.

There are other minor revisions which should be made in the law such as repealing the section that requires the community junior college name be that of the county or city where located; an amendment to allow the State Board of Education to determine the minimum qualifications for junior college instructors; a possible revision of the law concerning out-of-state and foreign student tuition, hopefully to allow the State Board of Education to set this tuition for community junior colleges instead of using actual full time equivalent student costs which have to be computed each year.

In summary, the Kansas Community Junior Colleges are committed to meet the present and future educational and training needs of the people of their communities. They are accomplishing their goal by providing comprehensive programs at a minimal cost to the student so that all who desire and can benefit may attend regardless of their financial capability.

Computers and the Junior College

James K. Hitt
Director of System Development
The University of Kansas

Part I. *Transactional Data Processing, Using Punched Cards.*

Punched cards and unit record equipment (key punches, sorters, collators, reproducers and electronic accounting machines) have proved useful in many educational institutions as devices to facilitate the day by day administrative transactions involved in keeping track of students, financial accounts, and institutional facilities. The punched card is a convenient form in which to store information and the machines which can sort, rearrange, and reproduce the punched cards and print out the information contained in them are accurate and rapid, and can handle large volumes of data more efficiently than can be done by ordinary hand clerical techniques.

Applications of punched cards are easily found in the office of student records. These applications include the functions of admissions, registration, and maintenance of student academic records, and the cards used to perform these functions provide a useful source of statistics about students. Many junior colleges have already established workable systems of student record keeping that involve punched cards and the related unit record equipment.

Applications of punched cards may also be found in the financial office, where there is need to keep track of the dollars involved in student fees, accounts payable, and payroll. Combinations of data found in student records and financial records allow the development of statistics having to do with faculty load, cost per credit hour, and other important considerations that affect the management of the institution.

Punched cards are also useful in developing files of information about the facilities of the institution, —the physical inventory of equipment and supplies, inventory of classrooms and buildings, and the other things purchased by the dollars acquired by the institution for conversion into the environment in which the educational function takes place. Relationships can also be developed between the financial side of the institution, and its facilities, to further assist in getting a picture of the cost of doing business.

Traditionally, the application of punched cards has been on a piecemeal basis, with primary emphasis on either student records, or financial records, without much attention being devoted to establishing interrelationships between these important areas. Even so, the advantages of accuracy and high speed make punched card equipment valuable enough to justify its cost and maintenance. If there were no other tools available, a substantial case could be made to justify punched card equipment as a clerical tool in the management of a junior college.

However, punched cards and unit record equipment are basically obsolete, because of explosive developments in the computer area, and the realization of the fantastic capabilities of computers to serve management, if profitably used. The present day "third generation" computer (which in itself is well on the way toward obsolescence, as newer devices become available) is an outgrowth of the need to solve complex problems of data analysis and computation related to research and scientific calculations. These same computers, on the other hand, are being used by the industrial world to capture, collect, retrieve and display data to assist management in its responsibility of effectively directing the commercial enterprise. They have great utility and applicability as well to the administration and operation of educational enterprises.

This paper, therefore, bypasses and ignores the many advantages of punched cards and unit record equipment, and moves on instead to discuss the more modern computing machines, and their applications to junior colleges.

PART II. *Computers and Systems Development in the Junior College.*

The computer is a fantastically complex and expensive machine, capable of capturing, storing and manipulating vast amounts of data, with unbelievable accuracy and speed. Its very complexity has called into being a whole new category of technically expert personnel: systems analysts, programmers, systems programmers, and operators. The detailed functions of the machines, and the technical duties of the specialists required to operate them are generally beyond the range of understanding of the administrator who employs the computer to do his work. However, the capabilities of the computer can be expressed simply, and the thought processes required of the administrator considering the use of a computer can be easily enough described for him to understand how to make the decision as to whether or not to acquire a computer, and, if so, how to direct its efforts.

The computer is, quite simply, a "black box," capable of producing output reports built to the specifications of the user, provided that input requirements have been met, as specified by computer personnel, once the output reports have been described. The output reports may be literally any information the user desires to have: reports of student performance, reports of faculty load, reports of utilization of space, reports of cost per credit hour of a given curriculum, are sample types of information that readily come to mind. Exercise of ingenuity and imagination will produce many more.

Once the general output report is described and identified in precise terms, analysis of the data required to produce the report, and the calculations necessary, will suggest the input elements and the timing of their insertion in order to produce the output report when it is needed. Computer technicians are capable of writing the "program" (directions to the computer

required to produce the results), once the institutional administrator has prescribed the output he requires, and has agreed to produce input according to the requirements of the computer. However, nothing happens until the administrator himself, and his staff, become involved in the process to the extent that the preliminary directions indicated have been given.

Systems analysis is the term presently used to describe the overall thought process involved in building a system, in which the computer may or may not be utilized in producing desired output. Systems analysis makes use of the systems approach, which must be understood by administrators, and one in which administrators must become personally involved, if they are to make wise decisions as to whether or not they need computers in the first place, and if computers are to be utilized, the best ways to use them. Detailed knowledge of the interior functions of computers is not important; complete understanding of and involvement in systems analysis is of importance.

An administrative data system is a comprehensive and efficient plan for collecting, storing, analyzing, retrieving, and displaying data required for administrative transactions, control, decisions, and planning. The administrative transactions of an institution of higher education center around four major areas: student records, employee records, physical facilities records, and financial records. Depending upon the size of the institution, these records may be centralized or decentralized. Irrespective of the degree of centralization or decentralization, specific output requirements, and the related calculations and transactions, can be identified in each of these areas.

Relationships between elements of data in each of these major areas are of concern to the central administrator, and also may be described in terms of desired output. Control functions based upon limitations in dollars, space, number or quality of students, qualifications and salary of faculty, may be introduced as part of the output requirements. Transactional improvement, that is, increased accuracy, speed, and efficiency in handling daily operations may in itself be sufficient justification for utilizing a computer, although the advantages here will not be substantially greater than in punched card equipment, unless volumes are extremely great. However, the consideration of control features, in addition to transactional improvement, may tip the scales in favor of computer operation.

The presence of daily transactional data in the system establishes a historical record on which decisions for future plans may be based. A currently operating system represents a state of dynamic equilibrium among elements of data, reflecting the conditions of the present, which can be used to establish a model of the institution. For future planning, assumptions can be made regarding changes in certain elements of the data, and these assumptions can be introduced into the model as perturbations of these data elements, from which corresponding values of other elements of data can be calculated, and in this way a hypothetical model of the future, based on

certain assumptions, can be established. The value to the administration of a computer based system, for future planning, represents one of its most important potential payoffs.

Such an administrative data system would at the same time establish a valuable data base for educational research, to answer inquiries as to the effectiveness of the educational program as well.

Analysis of a proposed computer system can also include the consideration of computer-assisted instruction in the classroom. Regardless of the educational merits or disadvantages of computer assisted instruction, such innovation cannot take place by itself. There must be a computer base from which to work, and a computer system of the size needed for an administrative system would ordinarily have additional capacity that might be utilized for computer assisted instruction in the classroom.

The computer is not only a tool that may be used to assist in instruction; the computer itself is something that students need to know about, and, in junior colleges particularly, many courses can be offered on aspects of the operation of the computer. Courses in key punching, programming, computer operation, system analysis and design, and computer science are all within the realm of curricular possibility in an institution that has a computer on board for daily operational requirements.

"After growing wildly for years, the field of computing now appears to be approaching its infancy."[1] The applications of computers are not restricted to large corporations, or to large universities. Substantial advantages can accrue to junior colleges who investigate this important modern tool. The systems approach is necessary in order to determine first whether a computer is needed, and second, the best use to make of it.

The ideas sketched in this paper are necessarily treated briefly, but there is a wealth of information in current literature to which those interested may turn for further detail. Some of the more interesting presentations available at the present time are found in the bibliography which follows. New articles constantly appear in the journals devoted to computing, management, and administration. Those who have already learned how to utilize punched cards and unit record equipment will have to think in terms of transition to more sophisticated computers, while those who are oriented to operating by hand, may consider making a single transition to computer based operation, without having to go through the punched card phase.

Those who plan to work in the area of junior college administration cannot afford to be ignorant or unaware of the potential of the modern computer, or of the necessity of the systems approach in evaluating its feasibility and utility in their institutions.

---

[1] "Computers in Higher Education" (Washington, D.C. The White House, 1967).

Bibliography

"The Systems Approach." Ralph A. VanDusseldorp. *NEA Journal.* February 1967.

"The Business of Education." Edward J. Menkhaus. *Business Automation.* May 1965.

"Information Systems in the University Administration." *Bulletin of the Inter-university Communications Council.* (EDUCOM) January 1968.

"Computers on Campus." Caffrey and Mossman. *ACE.* Washington, D.C.

"Systems for Measuring and Reporting the Resources and Activities of Colleges and Universities." *NSF* 67-15.

"Computers in Higher Education." (Washington, D.C. The White House, 1967).

The American Two-Year College

TILGHMAN H. ALEY, *President*
Casper College, Casper, Wyoming

An interesting scientific phenomenon found in the life and behavioral sciences is that of maturation. The metamorphosis of the development of the American two-year college is then possibly analagous to the maturating concept. The great American psychologist Gardner Murphy was fond of defining maturation as going from the general to the specific. Possibly this parallel can be found in tracing the development of the two-year institution as it attempted to find its rightful role.

In my lifetime I have watched the two-year college emerge from sort of a pauperish stepchild of the public schools, too often relegated to an unused basement or third floor of a high school, to the sophisticated and mature institutions of today. Indeed, many of the two-year, post-high school community colleges boast facilities and staff equal to the thirteenth and fourteenth year offered in any college throughout the land. It is an incontrovertable fact that the two-year college is the most viable and rapidly growing of any segment of American education from preschool through the graduate and professional school; therefore, possibly any discussion, as we direct ourselves to a depth study of this emerging institution, should have as its foundation some rapid review of some of the major influences that brought it into fruition.

It is always difficult to enumerate absolute positives, but it might well appear that there are three dominant influences that brought it into being. First, it is highly probable that the format of our liberal arts college was a borrowed pattern from that of the British; for, in effect, the British counterpart trained young men to be polished gentlemen, especially with the idea of preparing for service in civil affairs, military service, and the ministry. Indeed, one has but to survey those early institutions that emerged on the eastern shores of the colonies as they rapidly developed into a baccalaureate program dedicated to the offering of liberal arts and sciences. A second major contributing factor was that of the university, which was more or less a borrowed pattern from the German culture. It is interesting to note that Johns Hopkins, which probably was one of the truly first pioneers in the university concept as we know it today, was developed after the president and a number of his senior staff actually spent a year in Germany. And from this humble beginning developed the great university complex system, dedicated both to instruction and research, and the subsequent development of the graduate and professional schools, which have played such a key role in the rapid development of our nation.

The question then begs itself—what was the third influence. The American high school, which generally was dedicated to the necessity of the proper preparation for admission into the baccalaureate institution, soon began to

develop into a comprehensive type of an educational unit that, in general, turned people into the world of work for societal needs. At the end of the first two decades following the turn of the century, it became perceptibly apparent that everyone could not, or should not, go into the baccalaureate program. Further that a demanding scientific technology had far outdistanced the skills that could be attained in the high school setting to provide a trained personnel pool to meet the demands of business and industry. In recognition of this void, experiments began to evolve such as post-high school attendance, the development of more apprentice training, and certainly a bulk of the training fell to business and industry as they set about to instruct personnel to the areas peculiar to the business and industrial sector. Shortly thereafter there emerged the American two-year college in an attempt to fill this void. Suffice it to say that this latter development was not a borrowed one, but something native to the United Staes. One would certainly be remiss if he did not point out that other cultures in other lands have, in effect, borrowed the American pattern as they attempt to keep their educational structure compatible with employment demands.

There are today some 1000 two-year colleges in operation and they are developing at the current time at the rate of over 50 a year. In its early genesis the two-year college of a private nature far outnumbered those supported publicly, and generally the public institutions came into being as an organic part of the public schools. Subsequent developments are now such that the private schools are on the decline and the public two-year institutions are rapidly expanding. It is possibly interesting to note that the past decade has borne witness to the divorcement of the two-year college from the public schools and subsequently it has been accorded its own tax district and its own board of control. Its basic fiscal support emanates from three sources, with the lesser amount coming from tuition; a second source being an ad valorem tax on the assessed valuation of the district, and a third major source being that provided by the state. Proportionate shares of the various costs vary from state to state, but inasmuch as we are looking at this development from a broad perspective, we will not delve into financial patterns, but only comment that in view of the philosophy that higher education is a responsibility of the state, the trend is more and more for the states to assume a larger proportion of the operating costs. Yes, the two-year college is truly an American development. It was resisted with vigor; it was denegrated, ridiculed and scoffed at with the hope it would go away, but it didn't; it perservered. It was finally tolerated and it has probably only been in the past fifteen years that it has truly begun to be accepted. It succeeded because it was needed and it did the job despite the fact that it was not always openly embraced by society and particularly in some segments of its four-year counterpart. In reflecting on the contributions of those early pioneers of educational statesmanship, it becomes difficult to say what one person made the great major contributing influence. The development emerged as sort of an additive trial and error concept and so very many contributions

were made in the formative years. Certainly one of those that played a significant role was an early president of the University of Chicago, William Rainey Harper, who became concerned, indeed disenchanted, over the make-up of the clientele of his institution. It appeared to Harper that there was a great heterogeneity of abilities and interests and indeed of ages, and he became concerned about this variability. Accordingly he made two significant moves, one of which was that he felt that some of the better teaching was going on in some of the senior high schools, and so he set about to state to some of the fine high schools in his geographical area that if they would offer post-high school work in some academic areas that this would be acceptable as credit at the University of Chicago. A second effort was a concern over the variability of motivation and age differential, and so he established two major divisions in the university, the senior division which consisted of the 15th and 16th year, and a junior division composed of the 13th and 14th year. It was natural then to refer to the upper unit as the senior division and the lower one naturally became known as the junior division, hence the term the junior college. A Webster's definition of junior would suggest that it refers to something that is younger or of a lesser stature, and surely this was not the intent of Harper. The generic term junior college probably found its root in the junior division of the university in which work was offered in the freshman and sophomore year. Therefore, I submit to you that the term junior college is somewhat of a misnomer today. In reality junior college would refer to transfer work of the 13th and 14th years. Recent years have watched the emergence of the community college concept, which connotes work of the freshman and sophomore level of a broader perspective to include offerings of the transfer nature and courses of a terminal career structure, either of a one or two-year duration. Therefore, when I read of the term community-junior college, such as found in this state, it seems somewhat redundant. Probably the term community college should refer to an institution that purports to afford post-high school education in a given community in the areas of transfer and career programming that of course includes other responsibilities of general education, community services, recreational needs, cultural development, and ever so many other charges mutually dependent on the area of its service.

So very often the business of semantics poses great problems. In reality science has done a better job; for one can speak of an erg or an ion and it generally means the same general concept to all concerned. Yet, in too many cases, some terms are so broad, indeed so vague, as to be almost meaningless. It is fashionable today to speak of vocational-technical education, which runs a wide gamut of extremes of probably everything not included in the traditional transfer pattern. It would appear that it might be far more accurate to reflect on career programs. While it is unfortunate that it ever happened, the truth remains that far too many well-intentioned people have created a negative image in the term vocational. For ever so many eons of time admissions officers, public school administrators, and

counselors have had a tendency to relegate the term vocational as a general catch-all for the youngster that either couldn't or wouldn't adapt himself to an academic pursuit. It is not uncommon, unfortunately, even today that, if the young educand can't find his way to the men's room, too many people have a tendency to say that he is not college material and therefore should pursue a vocational program. In the first place it is wrong to lump them together in a single concept because they are widely different. A career program, or terminal program, could conceivably, indeed does in great measure, develop areas outside of the vocational-technical perspective. True technical education probably connotes an area halfway between the professional and the craftsman. It becomes almost a point of reference of midmanagement where the training embraces a bifurcation of such a nature that half of his preparation is in the so-called academic area and the other half in a very pragmatic context. Therefore, he becomes sort of an interpreter of the professional to the craftsman, and the true technician is truly in great demand. An estimate might be that for every professional placed upon the market place eight technicians are needed in a supporting role. For example, the petroleum technology spectrum is such that the technician placed in a midmanagement position is halfway between the geologist, the geophysicist and the skilled worker such as, for example the pumper, and various others of his colleagues. The technician enjoys the status of speaking both the language of the professional and the general practitioner. He can become in effect almost an interpreter. The petroleum technologist should be afforded a cluster of the academic disciplines in the general fields of mathmatics, geology, related sciences, communication, and the other half of his work should be offered in the technology peculiar to his field. These might include instrumentation and calibration, well logging, elements of drilling and petroleum production, computer principles for the petroleum industry, natural gas and its transportation.

The term vocational education in the post-high school two-year unit would probably refer to the acquisition of a skill that gives an actual setting and experience in the development of such a skill with some supporting cognate courses. Vocational education of the two-year college nature would refer generally to a certain manual dexterity of a sophisticated nature. In the two-year automotive program certainly there is a manual skill afforded in a block of time to the youngster to enable him to handle the task to which he is charged. Coupled with this major block would be a cluster of general education and possibly some scientific supporting ones related to a proper understanding of his specialty. In a day of complexity and sophistication of the automobile, the skilled mechanic is not worth his salt unless he truly understands the basic elements of electricity, hydraulics, and other such common learnings if he is to be effective in his pursuit.

Part of the reason that the American two-year college was resisted so heroically, and generally this resistance came from the higher education community on the grounds that the two-year school did not have academic

respectability, is that it served as an imaginary threat to the existence of the four-year college or university. Indeed, one of my four-year college counterparts once stated in righteous indignation, "You people (the two-year colleges) are taking away our money," which is strange for it always seemed to me that fiscal resources should be afforded to the youngsters. Other objections were couched in the vein that the emergence of the community college would militate against the enrollment in the four-year structure. It is perhaps significant to look at the record and see what has happened. Certainly one of the academic ghosts that has been exorcised has been that the two-year institution has its own role and purports to fit into a common total pattern. Certainly the community college has not served to weaken the four-year college or university for the antithesis is nearly always found. Where the two-year college flourishes, likewise does the four-year college counterpart. For many years almost half the two-year college population was found in the state of California and certainly those institutions have not suffered. It would appear that the California three-layer pattern of the state university system, the state college system, and the two-year college structure militates in favor of an articulated program. What then is the reason that accounts for mutual growth. First and foremost it puts more youngsters into the upper division, graduate and professional schools. The high dropout rate in the freshman and sophomore year in all post-high school education suggests that there are many people not ready for enrollment, either by the lack of ability, maturity, motivation, and especially the white collar syndrome transmitted by many parents to their youngsters suggests that there are far too many students enrolling in arts and science programs that lack at least one dimension to achieve success. It is generally accepted that the two-year college serves as a stepping stone between the high school and the four-year college. There are several reasons why the youngster does not succeed in a university complex, one of which is that he is so very often lost in the anonymity of bigness, but certainly one of the major factors is his inability to make the adjustment from high school to university. I suggest to you that the two-year unit has done a significant job in helping in this transition, and possibly an even more penetrating one in the nature of an exploratory process as he attempts to make up his mind, so to speak, as to just what is his cup of tea. Therefore, it is my premise that the community college does not in any way attempt to supplant the present four-year university pattern, indeed it wishes only to supplement it.

The differences between the two schools are legion. The two-year unit more often than not caters to a clientele of greater heterogeneity, not only in ability, but certainly in purposes and goals. If one were to have to delineate the major differences between the two-year unit and the four-year counterpart, the former is probably more dedicated to basic instruction and the latter probably more to research. Far too often the university structure has given the front of its hand to research and the back of its hand to instruction. Generally it is a truism that community colleges are smaller in nature

and cater to a service community of lesser size yet of broader implications. Certainly a significant aspect of the community college is that it affords a greater degree of flexibility that provides an opportunity to move from an academic field to one of a career nature and continue without too much loss.

Certainly an interesting tautology is that possibly one of the reasons for the success of the two-year school likewise can be considered part of the rationale in its slowness of acceptance. The mere fact that it started from the fountainhead of the public high school certainly was a contributing factor in its promotion, yet on the other hand the high school image that accompanied the development to that of a secondary position in the mind's eye of ever so many people for such a long time probably served as a serious deterrent. In its early history the community college teacher qualifications were certainly suspect and in many cases rightfully so. As an example, my experience in the state of Kansas where junior college teachers were required to be certificated, it is not uncommon for a person to have a master's degree where the bulk of it was in the so-called professional education courses, and his academic preparation was inadequate to the task. Part of the reason, then, for their failure to have sufficient depth in their academic area was an imposition from above that literally forced them into an area of endeavor that was not only meaningless but took them away from the depth preparation of their teaching field. An acquaintance of mine, a teacher with 25 years of experience both in the classroom and in an administrative role, holding a Ph.D. from the University of Texas, was forced to go to summer school for three courses before he could be certified to be the president of a California junior college. At this venture I cannot recall all three courses, but one of them was a course in audio-visual education which had to be completed prior to the time he could legally assume his role as an administrative statesman. It is refreshing to note that the current trend is away from certifictaion of the two-year college teacher. How anyone can espouse that the two-year college teacher should be certified when his counterpart in the four-year unit teaching on the 13th and 14th year level is not is literally beyond my comprehension. The question then naturally raises itself as to what should be the proper background of preparation for the person involved in this teaching process. In my own setting we try and hold to the general tenet that each instructor should have an undergraduate degree with a strong general background in the arts and sciences, which presupposes an undergraduate major and possibly related minors, plus a minimum of a master's degree in the area to be taught. A recent survey reflected that the mean post-master's level hours of the staff with whom I am associated is that of thirty hours. It would be my hope that the teacher could be afforded some basic exposure in evaluation, guidance, and the two-year college philosophy, but certainly not in the pattern to which it has been in the past, which forced ever so many to take everything from sandpile to door-knob counting. A recent survey in my own institution reflects that

some forty per cent of the staff have strong business and/or industrial experience, which of course is particularly true in career programming.

Yes, the community college has come a long way, though we still have a long way to go. In those formative years so very many mistakes were made, and indeed still are. Possibly it is akin to a conversation between the white rabbit and Alice in Wonderland when the rabbit asked Alice where she was going, and when she replied that she did not know, his laconic reply was something to the effect that it really didn't make any difference as long as she kept on going, and possibly this is akin to the position of the two-year school. A consummation to be wished is that not only do we know where we are going, but that we keep on doing so. What has been attempted here is to recount to those of you who are new to the two-year field some of the background that has contributed toward the positive development enjoyed by the two-year institution. It is to be hoped that we have shown the absolute necessity of an articulated system of post-high school education, and likewise it is hoped we have slain some academic ghosts in this bit that the two-year college is a threat to existing four-year schools. At the risk of being personal, it has to be pointed out that this writer is serving as a consultant for a new two-year school to be developed within a stone's throw of the University of Illinois, certainly one of the great universities of the nation, but the two have separate and distinct roles. If there is any parallel in the maturation concept, while we might take some pride in the fact that we are approaching maturity, there is still so very much to do and a long way to travel. Possibly an even closer parallel is found in those lines from Frost when he reflected that "the woods are lovely, dark and deep, but we have promises to keep. And miles to go before we sleep; and miles to go before we sleep."

Available Issues of KANSAS STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Those issues of *Kansas Studies in Education* which are still in print are listed below. Copies may be secured at cost by requesting them from the Dean, School of Education, The Univeristy of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044.

Vol. 2, No. 6, "Abstracts of Doctoral Dissertations in Education," by Mary Fee, Reid Hemphill, J. M. Jantzen, L. A. Fleming, E. D. Lock, E. Thayer Gaston, C. H. Brown. 1941, 79 p.

Vol. 2, No. 10, "Graduate Research in Education and Abstracts of Doctoral Dissertations in Education, 1940 to 1943. 1944, 31 p.

Vol. 3, No. 3, "A Summary Report to the North Central High Schools of Kansas on Criterion 5: School Plant and Equipment," by Kenneth E. Anderson. April, 1954, 24 p.

Vol. 4, No. 1, "A Summary Report to the North Central Schools of Kansas on Criterion 3: School Staff," by Herbert A. Smith and Kenneth E. Anderson. April, 1954, 24 p.

Vol. 4, No. 2, "Body Measurements of Male Students Entering the University of Kansas," Edwin R. Elbel. May, 1954, 24 p.

Vol. 5, No. 2, "A Summary Report to the North Central High Schools of Kansas on Criterion 4: Administration and Supervision," by Herbert A. Smith and Kenneth E. Anderson. April, 1955, 62 p.

Vol. 7, No. 1a, "Who Would be Eliminated? A Study of Selective Admission to College, with an addendum: 'The Class of 1958,'" by George B. Smith. December, 1956, 28 p.

Vol. 9, No. 1, "Let's Look at the Record! The High School Preparation of 1124 University of Kansas Freshmen," by George B. Smith. September, 1958, 71 p.

Vol. 10, No. 1, "Teaching Reading in the High School," Parts I and II (reprint), by Cloy S. Hobson and Oscar M. Haugh. February, 1960, 32 p.

Vol. 10, No. 2, "A Study of Questionnaire Responses from Kansas High School Participants and Non-Participants in the National Merit Scholarship Testing Program," by A. W. Dirks and Kenneth E. Anderson. April, 1960, 28 p.

Vol. 11, No. 1, "A Study of the Relationships Between Grade-Point Averages, Placement-Test Scores, Semester Hours Earned, and Area of Major Interest, for the Group Who Entered The University of Kansas in the Fall of 1954," by E. L. Barnhart and Kenneth E. Anderson. January, 1961, 36 p.

Vol. 12, No. 1, "Heights and Weights of College Students," by Edwin R. Elbel and Ralph I. Canuteson. March, 1962, 24 p.

Vol. 12, No. 2, "A Study of the Interest in Art of Adults with and without Elementary School Creative Art Experience," by Maud Ellsworth and Dana F. Johnson. April, 1962, 22 p.

Vol. 13, No. 1, "A Proposal for the Administrative Unit of Educational Organization in Kansas," by Phil A. Cook. September, 1962, 40 p.

Vol. 13, No. 3, "A Study of 6,750 Kansas High School Seniors in 101 North Central Association Schools," by Kenneth E. Anderson, Dale Scannell, and Lawrence T. Casto, June, 1963, 26 p.

Vol. 14, No. 1, "Let's Look at the Record Again!" by George B. Smith. September, 1963, 92 p.

Vol. 14, No. 2, "The University of Kansas Conference on External Testing Programs." January, 1964, 24 p.

Vol. 14, No. 3, "Physiological Determinates of Behavior: Implications for Mental Retardation." June, 1964, 117 p.

Vol. 15, No. 1, "Publications of the School of Education, University of Kansas, 1921-1964," by Ross O. Armstrong. April, 1965, 44 p.

Vol. 16, No. 2, "The Learning Environment: Relationship to Behavior Modification and Implications for Special Education," by Norris G. Haring and Richard J. Whelan. June, 1966, 68 p.

Vol. 17, No. 1, "Studies of Gifted Children Completed by Students at the University of Kansas," by Robert L. Cornish. January, 1967, 39 p.

Vol. 17, No. 2, "The Second Annual Kansas College and University Conference," June, 1967, 24 p.

Vol. 18, No. 1, "The University of Kansas Symposium on Language Development," April, 1968, 47 p.

Vol. 19, No. 1, "The American Two-Year College in Transition," January, 1969, 00 p.